

13 December 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence  
Deputy Director for Plans  
Deputy Director for Science and Technology  
Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Committee on Professional Manpower

1. Pursuant to the agreement reached at our meeting of 5 December, I have established, effective immediately, an ad hoc committee to examine the recent input of professional officer personnel with respect to the quality of these officers in relationship to near- and long-range Agency manpower needs. The members of the committee are John Richardson (Chairman), [REDACTED] and Donald Chamberlain.

25X1

2. In connection with its mission, the committee will review such questions as: sources of new officer personnel, qualitative standards applied in their selection, whether these standards are adequate and are being maintained at suitable levels, the measures taken to provide for the continuing development of professional officer personnel, and whether action is needed to improve the Agency's competitive position with respect to attracting and retaining highly qualified personnel. The committee will submit its report by 29 February 1968.

3. I have advised the committee members of the Director's interest in this survey and have encouraged them to call upon you for any necessary support and assistance during the conduct of their study.

/s/ L. K. White

L. K. White  
Executive Director-Comptroller

cc: General Counsel  
Inspector General  
Committee members  
(Richardson, [REDACTED] and Chamberlain)

25X1

TO:

SUBJECT: DCI's Committee on Professional Manpower

Please have your Career Service Panel, by 22 January, provide concise, pithy, well-reasoned answers to the following questions:

(1) How does your Office establish the specific qualifications required for personnel who will be recruited to fit your Office vacancies? If there is more than one method, in general, by which you arrive at a given position qualifications list, please describe each as briefly as possible. If in general you do not set up a fairly complete set of qualifications, please state this.

(2) Taking into account that some of the DD/S&T Offices are relatively new, comment as well as you can on whether such hiring standards or position qualifications have gone up, down, or stayed about the same as compared to four or five years ago.

(3) How well does your Office believe the applicants which you ultimately have been able to hire fit the requirements established as per question (1)? Has there been any significant change in this situation in the last year or so?

(4) Do you believe that the position standards which you use for recruiting are satisfactory to carry out your Office functions, assuming you have succeeded in hiring personnel who meet them? If you have not been able to hire such personnel, are your standards set too high as regards Agency hiring capability? Are your standards too low because you have reduced them through failure to hire desired personnel in the past?

(5) How do you identify the comers in your Office? How do you in general, if at all, plan for the career development of such individuals? Does the Mid Career Development Program play any significant part in such identification, or in the program development of the identified individuals?

(6) Do you feel that among the employees in your Office more junior than your present Division Chief - Deputy Division Chief level (or equivalent) you clearly see the necessary leadership potential that in 10-15 years will provide your Office with the leadership it needs, or do you feel that in fact there is a dearth of such people among your present Office staff?

(7) Have you any suggestions to make as to how the Agency might improve its competitive recruiting position in comparison with

- (a) Other US Government Agencies
- (b) Industry - business
- (c) Universities

DONALD F. CHAMBERLAIN  
DD/S&T Representative  
Committee on Professional  
Manpower

COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL MANPOWER

Professional Employee Rating Form  
(DD/S&T)

TO:

SUBJECT: Survey of Recent Junior Professional  
Manpower Input

RE: \_\_\_\_\_

1. The Committee on Professional Manpower, which has been established by the Executive Director to examine the quality of recently-appointed junior professional officer personnel in the Agency, is reviewing the records of staff employees who entered on duty at grades GS-07 through 12 during Fiscal Years 1963-67, regardless of their present grades. In addition, in the DD/S&T, because of the fairly high proportion of recent EOD's who are in grades above GS-12, it appears necessary to extend our survey to include EOD grades of GS-13 and GS-14. Your assistance in this study is requested.

2. Office of Personnel Records indicate that the above-named employee is within this category. Please have the information on pages 2, 3, 4 and 5 completed for this employee. The information on pages 6 and 7 pertain to a group and need only be completed once by a given supervisor. Therefore, if a supervisor completes these forms for more than one employee he may destroy any unused pages 6 and 7. The information sought on pages 4 and 5 can best be provided by the employee concerned; however, when requesting the employee to complete this form, there is no need to refer to the rating form. If the employee is not available, your Personnel Officer should complete the data form from available records. Both the rating information and data forms should be returned to the Chief, Administrative Staff, DD/S&T ( [redacted] Room 6E38 Headquarters), not later than 22 January 1968.

3. An evaluation of this employee by his immediate supervisor (i.e., the person who writes his fitness reports) is requested. If his immediate supervisor is not available within the time period set, please have the evaluation completed by the available supervisor who is most familiar with the individual. In appearance, we realize that the scales below are quite similar to fitness reports. There

25

S E C R E T

are, however, very significant differences in the reasons for requesting this information and the uses to which it will be put. Fitness reports serve as a focus for discussions with subordinates, as motivational devices, as bases for promotion, etc., as well as evaluations of actual performance. Because of their manifold functions, fitness reports are typically not "pure" measures of performance but instead reflect a number of influences. Thus overall fitness report ratings are sometimes overly lenient, ratings of different characteristics of the same individuals may be more similar than they should be, and too many people receive the same ratings. We are asking each supervisor to attempt to avoid these pitfalls as much as possible and to produce relatively more accurate measures of this employee's performance (on the first three scales) and potential (on the next three scales). This committee will treat this information with strictest confidence, using it only for research purposes. Information provided will not become part of any personnel record nor will it influence the careers of the people being rated in any way. It is hoped, however, that information collected here will have an impact upon the Agency as a whole. If our research enables us to identify characteristics which differentiate best and poorest performers, in the future we shall be able to select proportionately more top-notch people.

This employee's actual overall performance is:

- \_\_\_\_\_ A. OUTSTANDING
- \_\_\_\_\_ B. Between OUTSTANDING and STRONG
- \_\_\_\_\_ C. STRONG
- \_\_\_\_\_ D. Between STRONG and PROFICIENT
- \_\_\_\_\_ E. PROFICIENT
- \_\_\_\_\_ F. ADEQUATE
- \_\_\_\_\_ G. WEAK

The quantitative aspect of this employee's performance (i.e., the amount of work he gets done) is:

- \_\_\_\_\_ A. OUTSTANDING
- \_\_\_\_\_ B. Between OUTSTANDING and STRONG
- \_\_\_\_\_ C. STRONG
- \_\_\_\_\_ D. Between STRONG and PROFICIENT
- \_\_\_\_\_ E. PROFICIENT
- \_\_\_\_\_ F. ADEQUATE
- \_\_\_\_\_ G. WEAK

- 2 -

S E C R E T

~~SECRET~~

The qualitative aspect of this employee's performance (i.e., the degree of excellence characteristic of his work) is:

- ☐ A. OUTSTANDING
- ☐ B. Between OUTSTANDING and STRONG
- ☐ C. STRONG
- ☐ D. Between STRONG and PROFICIENT
- ☐ E. PROFICIENT
- ☐ F. ADEQUATE
- ☐ G. WEAK

This employee has the potential for becoming a senior-level officer (GS-15):

☐ Yes ☐ No

This employee has the potential for becoming a supergrade:

☐ Yes ☐ No

This employee's overall potential for making significant contributions to the Agency in the future is best estimated as:

☐ Weak ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Above Average ☐ Outstanding

~~SECRET~~

COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL MANPOWER

Employee Biographic and Agency Data Form

Employee's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Personnel Serial Number \_\_\_\_\_

1. Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_

2. EOD Date \_\_\_\_\_

3. EOD Grade \_\_\_\_\_

4. Office/Division \_\_\_\_\_

5. Present Grade \_\_\_\_\_

6. Time in Grade \_\_\_\_\_

7. Present Job Title \_\_\_\_\_

8. Time under Present Supervisor in Months \_\_\_\_\_

9. Higher Education

(Degree)            (Year Granted)            (College or University)            (Major)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Academic Honors \_\_\_\_\_

11. Military Service (Extended Active Duty Only)

(Branch)            (Duration)            (Highest Rank)            (Field of Assignment)

12. Total Years of FULL-TIME non-CIA Civilian Employment

\_\_\_\_\_



13. Source from which Employee Entered Present Career Service (check)

- |                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a. Undergraduate Student _____  | f. Career Training Program _____     |
| b. Graduate Student _____       | g. Other Fed.Govt.Empl. _____        |
| c. College Faculty _____        | h. Other Agency Career Service _____ |
| d. Military Service _____       | i. Agency Contract Empl. _____       |
| e. Business/Private Empl. _____ |                                      |

14. Agency-Sponsored Training

- a. Internal (Courses Taken) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. External (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

GROUP SURVEY SECTION

3. Looking beyond this employee to the group of professional employees who have entered on duty in your office since 1963, and comparing them as a group with those who entered on duty before 1963, please comment on their caliber as follows:

- ☐ A. The current group is superior to the pre-1963 group.
  - ☐ B. The caliber of the two groups is essentially the same.
  - ☐ C. The current group is noticeably inferior to the pre-1963 group.
  - ☐ D. There is no basis in this component for making such a comparison. Please explain why.
- 
- 

4. Four major sources of input to the Agency professional officer ranks are listed below. Although recognizing that only one of them is significant to the DD/S&T, if you have any experience with any others of the listed sources, in the blanks provided, please rank these sources according to your estimation of the overall quality of input they provide (1=best, 4=poorest). If you use the category (other), please indicate where it would fall in this ranking but do not actually assign a number to it. Do not attempt to provide any rating for sources which have not contributed any manpower to the group you supervise.

☐ Career Training Program

☐ Direct Recruitment from Outside the Agency

☐ Lateral Transfer from another Directorate within the Agency

- 6 -

S E C R E T

S E C R E T

\_\_\_\_\_ Promotion from Sub-GS-07 Personnel

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify)

5. The following space is reserved for any general comments which you may wish to make about the quality of recently-appointed junior professional officer personnel in the DD/S&T.

DONALD F. CHAMBERLAIN  
DD/S&T Representative  
Committee on Professional  
Manpower

- 7 -

S E C R E T

Relative Ranking in Graduate Schools

Biosciences, Physical Sciences, Mathematics, Engineering

1. California (Berkeley)
2. Harvard
3. Stanford
4. Cal. Tech.
5. Illinois
6. Wisconsin
7. Michigan
8. MIT
9. Princeton
10. Yale
11. Minnesota
12. Cornell
13. Johns Hopkins
14. Rockefeller Inst.
15. UCLA
16. Washington (Seattle)
17. Chicago
18. Columbia
19. Pennsylvania
20. Indiana
21. Duke
22. Western Reserve
23. California (Davis)
24. Purdue
25. Texas
26. Yeshiva
27. Northwestern
28. Brandeis
29. Rochester
30. Brown
31. Iowa
32. Washington (St. Louis)
33. NYU
34. Rice
35. Ohio State
36. Carnegie Tech.